

REMARKS

Claims 84-122 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 84, 99 and 114 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at paragraphs [0078] and [0079] of the published application. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Ho at the interview held March 8, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 84-122 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as lacking utility and being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, claims 84-122 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. In particular, as agreed during the personal interview, a security policy is "created" because each of amended independent claims 84, 99 and 114 recite a step of outputting the security policy. Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, the subject matter of independent claims 84, 99 and 114 produce a useful, tangible result.

Further, with respect to claim 99, as agreed during the personal interview, the specification, for example, at pages 41-44, support a physical interpretation of mean plus function recited in claim 99. Further, the specification on page 98, lines 4-5, state that the storage means 14 is provided in the hard disk drive 600. Accordingly, claim 99 satisfies the tangibility requirement of §101.

For at least these reasons and those agreed to during the personal interview, independent claims 84, 99 and 114 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Further, claims 85-98, 100-113 and 115-122, which variously depend from claims 84, 99 and 114,

also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 for at least the reasons discussed with respect to the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. The Claims are Patentable over Peltier

The Office Action rejects claims 84, 85, 99, 100, 114 and 115 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over "Information Security Policies and Procedures, A Practitioner's Reference," to Thomas Peltier. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As tentatively agreed to during the personal interview, Peltier does not disclose "wherein the security policy includes settings of individual equipment components within the organization that implements the security policy," as recited in independent claims 84, 99 and 114. Nowhere does Peltier teach or suggest this feature.

Thus, for at least these reason discussed above and those agreed to during the personal interview, independent claims 84, 99 and 114 are patentable over Peltier. Further, claims 85, 100 and 115, which depend from claims 84, 99 and 114, respectively, are patentable over Peltier for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: March 12, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--